



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,668	01/10/2002	Isamu Ohshita	Q67887	2949
7590	03/29/2004		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20037-3213			ROY, SIKHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/041,668 Examiner Sikha Roy	OHSHITA ET AL. Art Unit 2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-4 is acknowledged.

Claims 5 and 6 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group II, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Drawings

Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1 line 10, "said insulating film" needs to be clarified. In claim 1 there are two insulating films recited – 1) an inter-layer insulating film and 2) an insulating film disposed between adjacent ITO films.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,373,453 to Yudasaka.

Regarding claim 1 Yudasaka discloses (Figs. 3A, 3B, 3C column 6 lines 5-40,60-65, column 7 lines 1-10, line 65 through column 8 line 10) an organic electroluminescent display comprising plurality of transparent pixel electrodes 41 composed of ITO film disposed on a transparent substrate 10 via an inter-layer insulating film 51, an insulating film 52 disposed between adjacent pixel electrodes, an organic EL film 43 deposited on ITO films, a cathode (opposing electrode op) deposited on EL layer and plurality of mask supporting insulating layers (bank layer bank, shaded region shown in Figs.3A-3C in which lines that slant to the left drawn at a large pitch) constituting a part of the insulating film 52. Yudasaka discloses (column 8 lines 18,19) that the opposing electrode op is generally formed by mask-sputtering, and hence these plurality of bank layers interposed between the op electrodes and the insulating film 52 are anticipated

as mask supporting layers on which mask is formed for the deposition of the op electrodes.

Regarding claim 1, the functional language that "preventing a metal mask which is used in formation of the organic thin film and the cathode thin film from being in contact with the pixel portion of the transparent substrate" has not been given patentable weight because it is narrative in form. In order to be given patentable weight, a functional recitation must be expressed as a "means" for performing the specified function, as set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 112, 6th paragraph, and must be supported by recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language.

Regarding claim 2 Yudasaka discloses (Figs. 1, 3B column 6 lines 3-11, 27-40,60-65) the active matrix display device 1 uses TFT substrate 10 as a base in which first TFT 20 connected with scanning signals, second TFT 30 and ITO film (pixel electrode) 41 are disposed over the inter-layer insulating film 51 and are connected to one another in an active matrix system.

Referring to claim 3, Yudasaka discloses (column 7 lines 65,66) the insulating mask- supporting layer (bank layer bank) composed of a resist film.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent 6,373,453 to Yudasaka.

Regarding claim 4, Yudasaka discloses the claimed invention except for the limitation of the insulative mask supporting layers having a reverse tapered shape. It has been held that a change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the shape of the insulative bank layers of Yudasaka in a reversed tapered configuration, since such a modification would have involve a mere change in the shape of a component.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 6,194,837 to Ozawa and U.S. Patent 6,380,672 to Yudasaka disclose active matrix display device having thick insulating film formed around the organic semiconductor film. U.S. Patent 6,596,443 to Weaver et al. discloses mask for patterning electrodes. U.S. Patent 5,773,931 to Shi et al. discloses barrier walls structures of different shapes providing discrete pixels in an organic electroluminescent device.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

S.R.
Sikha Roy
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879


NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800